

REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated February 4, 2009. Claims 1-4, 6-12, 19-22, 24-30, 33 and 34 are presented for examination, of which Claims 1, 11, 19, 29 and 33 are in independent form. Claims 1, 2, 10, 11, 19, 20 and 29 have been amended to define still more clearly what Applicant regards as his invention. Claims 33 and 34 have been added to provide Applicant with a more complete scope of protection. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1-4, 6, 8-12, 19-22 and 24-30 were again rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious from U.S. Patent 6,466,329 (Mukai) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0170973 (Teraura).

Applicant has amended independent Claim 1 to clarify further that an image forming system according to that claim is arranged to form a database in such a manner that when an image relating to desired subject data is formed on a first recording medium in an image forming by the image forming means, first identification information read from the RFID tag of the first recording medium and the desired subject data in association with each other are stored in the database. In addition, such system is also arranged to retrieve the subject data corresponding to the first identification information read from the RFID tag of the first recording medium on which the image relating to the desired subject data is formed, from plural subject data stored in the database, at a timing different from the image forming operation for the image relating to the desired subject data on the first recording medium, so that in accordance with a retrieval result, an image relating to the subject data corresponding to the retrieved first identification information is formed on a second recording medium already having the RFID tag different from the first recording medium.

That is, the system of Claim 1 is arranged to *form* the database by storing the read ID information and the subject data relating to the printed image, when the image is printed on a recording medium. In this connection, it should be noted that the amendments to the claim language have been made by taking into consideration the Examiner's comments provided in paragraph 3 of page 3 of the Office Action. Since these changes are to clarify that the claims are directed to what Applicant was already claiming, these changes while they do clarify the claim scope do not represent changes to what Applicant had previously been intending to claim (and believes that he was claiming).

The above-described feature of Claim 1 is not taught or suggested by *Mukai* and *Teraura*, taken separately or in any possible combination. As Applicant has discussed previously, the *Mukai* system itself generates bar code to be printed on a master form printing medium, and is silent on reading bar code from an RFID on the master form printing medium. That is, *Mukai* fails to disclose forming a database by storing, in the database, the ID information and page description language (PDL) data read from the recording medium, when printing is performed.

In the *Teraura* system, a determination is made as to whether a copy should be allowed, and this determination is made using an RFID. This document also is silent on storing read ID information in association with other information when printing is performed, thereby to form a database to be referred to in copy processing. Accordingly, with the foregoing clarification to the language of Claim 1, Applicant submits that that claim is clearly allowable over those two documents.

Independent Claim 11 also recites this feature. Independent Claims 19 and 29 are method claims corresponding to apparatus Claims 1 and 11, respectively, and the

foregoing discussion relating to Claim 1 therefore is also applicable to each of those other independent claims.

Newly-added independent Claim 33 recites an image forming system that is arranged to form a database by using ID information read from an RFID tag of a recording medium in such a manner that the read ID information is stored in the database when an image forming operation is performed. As described above, this feature is not taught or suggested by *Mukai* and *Teraura*, taken separately or together. (In particular, *Mukai* in contrast reads the ID information from the master-from printed medium to retrieve the PDL data.)

A review of the other art of record has failed to reveal anything which, in Applicant's opinion, would remedy the deficiencies of the art discussed above, as references against the independent claims herein. Those claims are therefore believed patentable over the art of record.

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one or another of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual consideration or reconsideration, respectively, of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York Office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Leonard P. Diana/

Leonard P. Diana

Attorney for Applicant

Registration No. 29,296

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

FCIS_WS 3265377v1